



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,320	10/29/2003	Franklin Duan	03-1169	7570
24319	7590	11/17/2004	EXAMINER	
LSI LOGIC CORPORATION			NGUYEN, TUNG X	
1621 BARBER LANE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MS: D-106				2829
MILPITAS, CA 95035				

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/696,320	DUAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tung X Nguyen	2829	X

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 05 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.121(d)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Eliashberg et al. (u.s.p 6,160,411).

As to claims 1, 9, Eliashberg et al. disclose in Figs. 2-3, the method and apparatus for testing a plurality of test structures (302 of figure 2) comprising: a logic circuit to be considered the logic area (306a of figure 2), wherein the logic circuit is configured to receive a triggering signal from computer (206 of figure 2, col. 2, lines 44-

48); the logic circuit connectable to a plurality of row of the test structures (302 of figure 2); and the logic circuit configured to selectively turn on the rows of the test structures depending on the triggering signal which is received (figure 2, col. 2, 44-48).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2-4, 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eliashberg et al. (u.s.p 6,160,411).

As to claims 2, 4, 10, 12, Eliashberg et al. disclose all of limitations except for the logic circuit is connectable to 256 rows of test structures. Eliashberg et al. disclose in col. 3, lines 44-47, the logic circuit couple to the plurality of rows of the test structures for reducing the number of testing, and for reducing cost during testing the plurality of test structures (col. 3, lines 44-47). Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to choose appropriate value of the rows of test structures for reducing the number of tests and reducing cost during testing the plurality of test structures (col. 3, lines 44-47), since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

As to claims 3, 11, Eliashberge et al. disclose all of limitations except for the test structures to be transistors, it is well-know that the test structures to be recognized the

transistor. For example, Kurit et al (u.s.p 5,289,116). disclose the system for testing the test structures to be transistors (see abstract). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize the test structures to be transistors.

6. Claims 5-8, 13-15, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eliashberg et al. (u.s.p 6,160,411), and in view of Kurita et al. (5,289,116).

As to claim 5, Eliashberg et al. disclose all of the limitations except for the logic circuit comprises an incrementer which is configured to receive the triggering signal. However, Kurita et al. disclose the logic circuit comprises an incrementer to be considered a counter (TMM of figure 1) for receive the triggering signal and sending signal to test the plurality of test structures (186 of figure 1). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Eliashberg et al., and provides an incrementer, as taught by Kurita et al. for receiving the triggering signal and sending signal to test the plurality of test structures (186 of figure 1).

As to claims 6-7, 13-14, Eliashberg et al. disclose all of the limitations except for the logic circuit comprises a decoder which is connected to the incrementer. However, Kurita et al. disclose the logic circuit comprises a decoder (ADC/DAC of figure 2) coupled to an incrementer to be a counter (TMM of figure 1) for receiving the triggering signal and sending signal to test the plurality of test structures (186 of figure 1). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Eliashberg et al., and provides a decoder coupled to

an incrementer, as taught by Kurita et al. for receiving the triggering signal and sending signal to test the plurality of test structures (186 of figure 1).

As to claims 8, 15, Eliashberg et al. in view of Kurita et al. disclose all of the limitations except for the incrementer being configured to receive the triggering signal and having eight output lines, and coupled to the decoder. However, Eliashberg et al., in view of Kurita et al. disclose the logic circuit having the incrementer coupled to the decoder for testing the plurality of rows of the test structures for reducing the number of testing, and for reducing cost during testing the plurality of test structures (col. 3, lines 44-47). Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to choose appropriate value of the rows of test structures for reducing the number of tests and reducing cost during testing the plurality of test structures (col. 3, lines 44-47), since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tung X Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Tokar can be reached on (571) 272-1812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TN
11/07/04


DAVID ZARNEKE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
